

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 9 are amended. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended by Examiners Rahmjoo and Bella to Applicant's representatives during the January 25, 2006 personal interview, are gratefully appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6, 8-14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ueda (U.S. Patent No. 5,900,860) in view of Nagai (U.S. Patent No. 4,126,310) and further in view of Murata (U.S. Patent No. 6,348,923); and claims 7 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ueda in view of Chernock (U.S. Patent No. 6,229,524). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview, none of the applied references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest an image generating system that includes object determination means that determines which part objects within a predetermined area in an aggregate object are objects to be changed in display form when an impact is applied to the aggregate object, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 9.


As admitted by the Patent Office (Office Action, page 2, lines 14-15), and as agreed during the personal interview, Ueda does not teach simulating breakage of the aggregate object where at least one part object physically separates from the aggregate object. Moreover, as also agreed during the personal interview, Nagai fails to teach that the aggregate object (i.e., airplane in Fig. 6) is formed by a plurality of part objects that are determined by an object determination means within a predetermined area of the aggregate object to be changed in display form. Moreover, Murata fails to cure deficiencies in Ueda and Nagai in

disclosing or rendering obvious these features. Accordingly, a combination of the applied references would not arrive at the claimed invention. Thus, independent claims 1 and 9, and their dependent claims, are patentable over the applied references. As such, withdrawal of the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-16 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Tarik M. Nabi  
Registration No. 55,478

JAO:TMN/amw

Date: January 27, 2006

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--